



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of one hundred days, which you can give to the souls in purgatory."

We have more than once before in this journal commented on this indulgent prayer, which combines in a single sentence prayer in the same words to beings who, as the Church of Rome asserts, ought to be honoured with quite different kinds of worship, namely, *latreia* to the first, *hyperdoulia* to the second, and *doulia* to the third. In this instance we hold that *latreia* is offered to all three; for what higher devotion can be given to the Supreme God than "I give you my heart and soul."

Page 15, both editions—"At your meals it is good not to eat some very little bit, at least a crumb, for the love of the infant Jesus."

We cannot help being struck with the unreality of modern Roman Catholic devotion. We cannot look on this "abstaining from a crumb" as any real fulfilment of the precept to do all things to the glory of His name, but merely as a childish piece of affectation and sham self-denial.

P. 19, *Simony*—"It is a mortal sin to buy or sell anything sacred, for example, the relic of a saint; but it is not a sin to sell the case containing the relic, for its just value, or to sell blessed beads for what they are worth without the blessing."

P. 20, first edition—"An oath is to call God or something sacred to witness that what you say is the truth; for example, to swear on the Book or by the name of God, or the holy name, by heaven, on my soul, so help me God. But if you do not know that what you say is an oath, or do not mean to take an oath, then these words are not oaths. It is not an oath to say faith, truth, on my life, on my conscience, true as I stand here, true as gospel; it is not an oath to say, I swear, God's truth, God knows, I declare to God, unless you mean these words for an oath; but it is commonly a venial sin to say such words."

The reader will observe the italics, which seem as if the author had particularly wished to give his readers instruction how to avoid being bound by their oaths.

In the new edition we find a decided change for the better. Instead of the words in italics we have Matt. v., "Let your speech be yea, yea, and no, no, and that which is over and above these is evil." Do not, then, in conversation say faith, truth, &c. Do not in talking say, I swear, &c.

P. 20, "THIRD COMMANDMENT. *Servile work.*—It is a sin to work on Sundays. It is a mortal sin to work for about two hours or two hours and a half."

It is not servile work to write, or teach, or draw, or sing, or play music, or travel. If a person does on a Sunday what is not servile work, it is not a sin to be paid for it."

P. 21, first edition—"It is a grievous sin to strike your parents, or in their presence to put out your tongue at them, or mock them, or the like, through spite, or contempt; or in their hearing to curse them or call them very bad names, such as fools, beasts, drunkards."

Whatever may be said in defence of this passage, we cannot conceive what justification can be attempted for the italics. Here the instructor in morals goes out of his way to tell his readers you may mock your parents, provided it be not in their presence; you may curse them and call them names, if it be not in their hearing. The sentence might have borne this meaning under any circumstances, but the italics do not allow it to bear any other. In the new edition the sentence is unaltered, with the exception of the words in italics, which are now printed in ordinary type.

The following sentence ran in the old edition, "Lesser works of disrespect are to look cross or sullen, speak in a disrespectful voice, give back answers, or make short answers." In the new edition: "These things are a less sin if they do not see or hear you; also to look sullen or give disrespectful answers."

P. 23, both editions—"It is not a sin to desire some temporal misfortune to another, in order that it may make him cease to give scandal, or be converted, or not persecute the good."

P. 14, old edition.—*Drunkennes.*—"What in Ireland is called the pledge is not a vow, but a promise, and to break it without just reason is a venial sin; therefore, if you take the pledge, you should keep it." Altered in the new edition to "Avoid all occasions of drunkenness. Drunkards shall not obtain the kingdom of Heaven.—Gal. v."

P. 26, old edition—"It is a venial sin to steal a little. It is a mortal sin to steal much; for example, to steal from a workman a day's wages, or to steal less from a poorer man, or more from a richer man, or from parents. If you steal from different persons, it needs half as much again for a mortal sin, and the same if you steal at different times. If you steal from different persons, as well as at different times, it needs double the sum."

The new edition omits these last directions how to steal without mortal sin, by pilfering from different individuals, and, instead, we have the following:—

"If you steal from a rich person, you commit a sin, because it is always a sin to steal; but if you steal the same from a poor man, you commit a greater sin, because the poor man suffers more from the loss."

The reader will remember, however, that this change in the tract does not imply any change in Roman Catholic practice. The question whether a particular series of thefts be a venial or mortal sin is still left to be determined by an arithmetical computation founded on the amount

stolen, the incomes of the persons defrauded, the number of persons robbed, and the interval of time between each theft.

P. 27, first edition—"Also, when materials are given for some work—for example, cloth to tailors—it is a sin to keep pieces which remain except people are quite sure that it is not against the will of the employer, or there is a common custom of doing it, and it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit. It is a sin to mix something with what you sell—for example, water with any liquor—except there is a common custom of doing it, and it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit."

In the new edition all this is omitted, and the space is filled up with the following matter, which is evidently inserted to fill up a gap. We do not know whether the reason may be that the work is always kept in type, so that it saved expense to make alterations in such a way as should not displace the position of any of the following matter, or whether the object was that the alterations should escape notice, as they have a chance of doing where the two editions are everywhere else line for line the same:—

"He who sells must be content with a reasonable profit, and when custom has fixed the price, then no more should be charged. About not paying wages to servants or others, St. James says that the wages due to the labourer, and not paid, cry to God for vengeance against him who withholds them. Behold the hire of the labourers, which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth, and the cry of them has entered into the ears of the Lord.—James v., 4."

P. 27 we find another small alteration:—

1st edition—"It is a sin, 5, to forge or imitate a person's writing, if you do any harm with it."

This passage, which seems to teach the possible innocence of forgery in some cases, was altered into, "5. Also to imitate any writing for some bad purpose."

P. 28, first edition. "*Eighth Commandment.*—Lies are always sins, but it is not a lie for a servant to say that her master is not at home, meaning that he cannot be seen, because every one understands this. Lies which do grievous harm to any one are mortal sins."

Second Edition. "A lie is a sin; a lie which does a grievous injury to another is a mortal sin. It is of such lies that the Holy Scripture speaks when it says—the mouth that lieth killeth the soul.—Wisdom i. 11."

Observe, that in the Roman Catholic system any amount of lying amounts to no more than a venial sin, unless the lies be malignant ones, intended to do injury to others.

The book concludes with an enumeration of the duties of particular states. The reader will learn with surprise that the duties of parents in respect to their children are "hatred, cruelty, beating them too much or without cause, or in a passion, cursing them, too much love and fondness for any of them, letting them have their own way."

We were disposed to conjecture that for "duties" we ought to read "sins," but the next set of duties will not bear this alteration. They are "care about their children, baptism in the Catholic Church, teaching them when very little, and making them say their prayers," &c., &c.

We are told that the duties of husbands and wives are—"Hatred, cruelty, beating, giving their affections to another person." That the duties of masters are—"Ill-treatment of servants, over-working them, not giving them food enough, or paying their wages, breaking their agreement."

All this sounds very alarming, and we only hope the writer's meaning is not as bad as his words. Archbishop Cullen ought to look to this in the next edition.

The first edition closes with the doxology, Praised be Jesus and Mary. We are glad to see that this is left out in the new edition. It seems, we hope, as if some influential Roman Catholics had been shocked at the change in their religion that has taken place since the time that books used to end with an ascription of glory to God, and not to the Virgin. We are glad of any indication that the remonstrances of such persons are listened to.

HOW DID POPE LEO AND HIS SUCCESSORS DEAL WITH THE 28TH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON?

We have now, in pursuance of the promise in our last number, to lay before our readers, as briefly and distinctly as we can, the manner in which Pope Leo and his successors dealt with the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon; but as the Fathers of Chalcedon, and the letters we have hereafter to bring before our readers, refer to what was done above 60 years before, at the Council of Constantinople, and 125 years previously, at the Council of Nice, it may be necessary before going further briefly to recall to our readers' recollection what had been done at those previous Councils in relation to the matters in question.

We shall first refer to the Council of Constantinople.

The Council of Constantinople was held A.D. 381-3, under Theodosius the Great, and is now universally known as the second General Council.

It was attended by 150 bishops, among whom were several distinguished men, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Timothy of Alexandria, and Meletius of Antioch.

Its canons are contained in the most ancient MSS. ex-

tant, and are printed in the Codex Canonum Ecclesie Universalis of Justellus and Voellus, p. 55, &c., and in Labbe and Cos., tom. ii., who give three different translations, one by Gentianus Hervetus, another by Dionysius Ezigius, the third by Isidore Mercator.—pp. 947, 954, and 958-9.

The third canon, according to Justellus and Gentianus, and which is given as the latter end of the second canon according to Dionysius Exiguus, and as the fifth according to Isidore Mercator, is as follows:—

"Let the Bishop of the City of Constantinople have the privileges of honour next after the Bishop of Rome, inasmuch as it is itself new Rome."

The Council of Nice, as our readers are aware, was held at Nicæa, in Bithynia, under Constantine the Great, A.D. 325. It was attended by 318 Bishops, and is universally received as the first General or Œcumenical Council of the Catholic Church of Christ.

The sixth and seventh canons were as follow:—

Sixth—"Let the ancient customs be preserved, which prevail in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, so that the Bishop of Alexandria may have power over all these places, inasmuch as the Bishop of Rome has the same custom. In like manner also in Antioch and in other provinces, let their privileges be preserved to the Churches. But this is altogether manifest, that if any one be made Bishop without the consent of his Metropolitan, this Great Council decrees that he ought not to be Bishop. But if two or three, contentiously, or induced by their own obstinacy, shall have contradicted this common suffrage of all, being agreeable to reason, and according to the Ecclesiastical rule, let the opinion of the majority prevail."

The seventh canon.

"Since the custom has obtained, and ancient tradition, that the Bishop of Ælia (or Jerusalem) has been honoured, let this prerogative of honour be continued to him, but without prejudice to the rights of the Metropolitan."

To any one who reads these canons simply and without any disposition to distort or strain them to support or oppose a preconceived theory, it would appear to us that they present no difficulty whatsoever.

The Fathers of Nice appear simply to have recognized the principle, that ancient usages ought to be respected, and, therefore, that just as the Bishop of Rome had his acknowledged jurisdiction within certain boundaries (the nature and extent of which we have already discussed, somewhat at large, in a former number), so ought also the Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and other Churches to be allowed to retain their accustomed privileges. "That is," says the learned and candid Dupin, "the jurisdiction and authority which they each had over many provinces, and which were subsequently known as the jurisdiction of the Patriarch or Exarch. It is in this sense that it compares the Church of Rome to the Church of Alexandria, by considering them both as Patriarchal Churches. It continues also to the Church of Antioch and all the other great Churches whatsoever right they could have; but lest their authority should be prejudicial to the ordinary Metropolitans, who were subject to their jurisdiction, the Council confirms what had been ordained in the fourth canon concerning the authority of the Metropolitans in the ordination of Bishops. This explication is easy and natural, and we have given many proofs of it in our Latin dissertation concerning the ancient discipline of the Church."

Our readers will observe that there is nothing in these canons either giving to or taking from the See of Rome any primacy or precedency whatsoever, or referring any right or privilege to a higher origin than the customs and usages of the Church; nor do these canons expressly in any way assert that Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem were to rank as between themselves in any particular order.

We are now, we think, in a position to make our readers understand the grounds upon which Pope Leo, in the year 452, impugned the validity of the 28th canon of the Council of Chalcedon.

This he did in three several epistles, all bearing the same date; but before we proceed to consider these letters, we cannot refrain from noticing that Pope Leo seems for some time after the return of his Legates to Rome to have been somewhat in a difficulty in obtaining any such accurate

* Isidori Mercatoris Decretalium Collectio—p. 292. Patrologie Curus, tom. cxxx. Migne, Paris, 1858.

b "Τὸν μὲν τοὺς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχιν τὰ προεβία τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νῦν Ρώμην."

c "Constantinopolitana civitas Episcopum habeat privilegia honoris post Romanum Episcopum, eo quod sit ipsa nova Roma."—Justellus et Voellus, p. 55. Paris 1682.

d Binius tries to persuade himself that this canon is suspicious, and of doubtful authority, among other things, because Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria, was present, to whose prejudice it was made, and who could scarcely, he thinks, have borne it with equanimity; but he is obliged to admit that the early Ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and Zozomen both record it, which, destroying his first theory, drives him to frame another equally gratuitous, that it was passed by stealth after Timothy had left the council, which is equally without any solid foundation either in probability or history.

e Labbe and Cos., tom. ii., p. 971. Socrates Hist. Eccl. Valerius ed. Lib. v. cap. 8. p. 265. Sozomen Hist. Eccl. Lib. vii., cap. 9, p. 714. Ibid., Valerius Amstelred., 1696.

f Codex Can. Eccl. Univ. Justellus and Voellus, p. 31. Labbe and Cos., tom. ii., pp. 31-41.

g CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. vi., p. 112.

h Dupin, Eccl. Hist. vol. i., p. 690.

i See Dupin de Antiqua Ecclesiam disciplina, Dissert. I., c. xii., p. 62. Paris, 1686.

knowledge as he could depend on as to what had been actually done at the Council of Chalcedon. We have already seen that the Legates were in some embarrassment from their ignorance of Greek. The Pope, though (according to the theory of certain modern divines) he was for more than 20 years himself the sole living interpreter of the true meaning of the Holy Scriptures, appears to have been himself almost equally ignorant of Greek, the very language in which the New Testament was written.¹ We have several such admissions throughout the epistles of Pope Leo, but the one we are about to mention so specially refers to the acts done at Chalcedon, that we may confine what we have to say on the subject to it alone.

It was addressed by Leo to his agent or vicar Julian, Bishop of Coos (who, it will be recollected, was himself present at, and signed the canons of Chalcedon), and it is given at length as Epistle lvi., in Labbe and Coss. tom. iii. p. 1338-40.

The passage we refer to is at the close of the Epistle, p. 1340.

"I desire to know whether my letter concerning the belief in the incarnation of our Lord, which I sent to you by Basil the deacon, was delivered to your brotherly care; I suspect it was not, because you have not returned any judgment concerning its contents in those Synodal acts which were done in the city of Chalcedon, as to which, however, we are less clearly informed, on account of the difference of the language. And, therefore, I specially enjoin on you, brother, that you will cause to be collected the whole proceedings into one book, translated into the Latin tongue, with the most careful accuracy (in Latinum sermonem absolutissima interpretatione translata), so that we may have no possibility of doubt as to any part of the acts done, nor any ambiguity remain as to any thing which came to your own knowledge after a careful study of the proceedings."

Having thus or otherwise made himself acquainted with the real nature of what had been done at Chalcedon, and after taking several months to consider how he ought to deal with them, Pope Leo, on the 11th of the Kalends of June (i.e., 22nd May), A.D. 452, indites three several letters to the Emperor Marcian, the Empress Pulcheria, and to Anatolius, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the subject. If we were to judge of what a Bishop of Rome in the 5th century was likely to write by what Roman Catholic advocates of the Papal supremacy would do in the present day, we should have anticipated that the leading feature of Pope Leo's letters would have been a strong protest against the Council of Chalcedon for having dared to refer his headship or primacy to the act or consent of the Church, or to anything but the institution of Christ Himself; and, secondly, a vigorous denunciation of the Council for taking on themselves to settle such a question as the relative powers and privileges of the Archbishops of Constantinople Alexandria and Antioch, without his authority, as the Vicar and Vicegerent of Christ upon earth. Alas! however, for modern theorists, these grand prerogatives were then so far from being conceded, that even so able and determined a prelate as Leo I., and one so anxious to increase his authority, does not so much as venture to allude to either of them, but confines himself to the very different task of complaining that the Council of Chalcedon had violated, not his authority, but that of the Canons of Nice, and that they had infringed the rights, not of himself as Bishop of Rome, but of the other apostolical sees of Alexandria and Antioch.

We now proceed to the letters referred to, and shall take them in the order above mentioned. They are much too long and verbose to transcribe at length, but as, according to our custom, we shall give the exact references to where they may be found in *extenso*, we doubt not our readers will rest contented with our abridgment, unless any of our Roman Catholic readers, after perusing the originals, shall be able to show that we have not abstracted them fairly.

The Epistle to the Emperor Marcian is No. VI. among those appended to the proceedings at Chalcedon by Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv., p. 846.

After congratulating the Emperor in very magniloquent terms on the triumph of truth and extinction of error by his (the Emperor's) glorious zeal, at the then recent Council, he proceeds to express his surprise and grief that "where so great a congregation of the priesthood had met together for such a good and desirable end, the spirit of ambition should have disquieted the peace of the universal Church." He then goes on to charge Anatolius, Archbishop of Constantinople, with want of modesty and immoderate ambition, and failure in reverence for the Canons of Nice, which he asserts to have been institutions of the Holy Spirit! Let Constantinople, he says, have its glory, but there is a difference between things secular and divine. It is no disgrace to the royal city that it cannot be made an apostolical see. The privileges of Churches instituted by the canons of the holy fathers, and fixed by the decrees of the venerable Council of Nice, cannot be rescinded by any wickedness, or changed by any novelty. That he should be a partaker in the guilt, if the rules which had been made in the Council of Nice for the regulation of the whole Church should be violated by his con-

nivance, and if he should be more influenced by the wish of one brother than by the common good of the whole house of God. He, therefore, prays the Emperor that he would strive to produce concord and peaceful unity, and beseeches him that he would wholesomely restrain the cupidity of his brother Anatolius, which, if persevered in, must be most hurtful to himself. He ought never, indeed, to have conceived such a wicked desire even in the secret recesses of his heart, but when those Bishops who acted in his (Leo's) place opposed him, he should, at least, then have desisted from his unlawful desires, under their salutary opposition! He then prays the Emperor to act the part of both a good king and good Christian, and oblige the said Bishop Anatolius to obey the fathers, lest he should cut himself off from the universal Church while he attempted things hostile to peace."

We can well imagine how the good Emperor Marcian must have smiled when reading such an excited letter. He well knew that no dissension had been caused, or was likely to be caused in the Church by the new decree; if, indeed, it went at all beyond the canons of the second General Council, which had been already acted on for over 60 years. He knew that the canon complained of, so far from being the subject of strife among the Eastern Churches (to which alone it applied), had been unanimously resolved on, and persisted in by the assembled Bishops, among whom was the much-injured Bishop of Antioch himself!! As to Anatolius cutting himself off from communion with the Church Universal, by acting on the canon in question, the Emperor well knew that Anatolius was only acting on what had been most deliberately and formally done by the greatest Œcumenical Council which had ever been assembled, in which Pope Leo might himself have been present if he liked, and was at any rate most fully represented, and in the presence of whose representatives the acts complained of had been done, which acts had also been approved of by his (the Emperor's) own Commissioners; and, accordingly, the prudent and calm Marcian, instead of acting on Pope Leo's advice, quietly ratified all that had been done by the Council of Chalcedon, and passed two Edicts, prosecuting by severe penalties all opposition to its decrees.

In the meantime, however, Pope Leo had also written, as we have stated, to the Empress Pulcheria, with whom, probably, he was better acquainted than with Marcian, and from whose influence he possibly expected more than from the judicious and temperate and experienced senator who, at the age of 60, had been raised to the imperial purple.

This epistle is No. LV. in Labbe and Cossart, tom. 3, p. 1336-8, and, in addition to the same charges of inordinate ambition against Anatolius which are contained in his letter to the Emperor, Pope Leo therein re-asserts that the consent of the Bishops had been *extorted* (with how little colour of truth we have already seen), laments over the picture of "so many metropolitans and quiet provinces whose rights had been trampled under foot, and reduced to a state of warlike disturbance, in order to increase the dignity of a single man, and which, though nearly sixty years before the thing had been attempted, no one had before been able to obtain." Leo then goes on, in the most pompous style, invoking meanwhile Pulcheria's pious aid, to declare void the consent of the Bishops, as being repugnant to the holy canons enacted at Nice, which he states to have been instituted by the Holy Ghost by the 318 Bishops, and by the authority of St. Peter the Apostle annuls altogether, by a general definition, everything done in contradiction to those canons, no matter by how many more Bishops it may have been decreed. He concludes by begging her to pardon his prolixity, and, as was her custom, to labour for the peace and unity of the Church, by restraining his brother Anatolius's ambition in a manner both salutary in itself and likely to profit him, as well as to redound to her own glory." How little effect all this grandiloquence produced in getting rid of the canons in question we shall see presently.

We have still, however, to treat of Pope Leo's letter to Anatolius himself, the tone of which is in somewhat striking contrast with the turgid bombast of his epistle to Pulcheria.

It is No. V. in Labbe and Cossart's collection, tom. iv., p. 844; and after dilating on Anatolius's violation of the canonical regulations in consecrating the Bishop of Antioch (with which, as a distinct and merely formal ground of complaint, we have nothing to do), and the asserted infringement of the holy canons of Nice, by which the Alexandrian See had lost its privilege of the second honour, and Antioch that of the third dignity, and all

the metropolitans subject to his jurisdiction were deprived of their proper honour, he goes on to assure him that no matter by how much larger a number of Bishops the decrees of the 318 at Nice might be opposed, whatever might have been done contrary to them would be devoid of all authority, whether they were seduced by corruption or compelled by fear to consent to his designs. That the venerable Fathers at Nice, after having condemned the sacrilegious Arius for his impiety, had passed ecclesiastical canons which would last to the end of the world; and if anything was presumed to be done in opposition to them, it ought, without delay, to be annulled. He alludes to the subscription of certain Bishops sixty years before (i.e., the Council of Constantinople), which, he says, no notice had ever been given of by Anatolius's predecessors to the Apostolic See; and, after again referring to the injustice done to the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch—the former of which had been founded by St. Mark the Evangelist, the disciple of St. Peter, and the latter by St. Peter himself—he winds up the whole by *exhorting and admonishing him in the Lord* to lay aside the desires of ambition, to be fervent in the spirit of charity, and to adorn himself profitably with spiritual virtues according to the Apostle's doctrine:—"Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not, is not easily provoked, nor puffed up, and seeketh not the things which are her own." How much more, therefore, does he sin who lusteth after the things of another? Be mindful, therefore, of His sentence who said, 'Hold that thou hast; let no man take thy crown.'—Apoc. 3. For if you shall seek things not granted to you, by your own act and judgment you will deprive yourself of the peace of the universal Church."

Thus ends this singular and instructive correspondence, which seems to have had no other effect on the Church universal than it had upon the Emperor on the one hand, or Anatolius and his 630 bishops upon the other. That Leo did not consider it, on mature reflection, prudent to press the matter further with the latter, we collect from a short letter which, in the succeeding year, on the 12th of the Kalends of April, 453, he addressed to the bishops who had been assembled in the Council of Chalcedon, in which he states that he adopts with his whole heart the decrees of that holy council for the confirmation of the faith, and merely in general terms exhorts them to observe the statutes of the Fathers in the Council of Nice, as being divinely inspired, and insinuates that anything which was done contrary to these canons, by whatever *extorted* assent it may have been confirmed, would be infirm and void. That they might learn how reverently he treated these rules, by reading what he had written to repel the attempts of the Archbishop of Constantinople, and that he was, with the Lord's assistance, acting in this matter as a guardian of the Catholic faith and the traditions of the Fathers."

If we had space, we might refer also to his letter to Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, in which he tried to rouse him up in defence of his alleged rights and privileges; but we think we have said enough to show how vain were the attempts even of a pope so highly gifted as Leo I. to rouse opposition to the decrees of which he complains, attempts which met no response from any of the parties affected, and which were subsequently, as we shall presently see, fully recognised by his own successors.

That Leo did not venture to base his opposition to the canon of Chalcedon upon any higher ground than its supposed contradiction to the sixth canon of the Council of Nice (which he consequently sought to exalt into an *immutable decree*, made under the *direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit*) is, we think, most instructive, as is also his affecting to be influenced solely by his fatherly regard for the privileges of the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch, instead of by any jealousy with respect to his own. Is this the way in which popes in after times would have dealt with a decree so subversive of their highest prerogatives as that of Chalcedon?

It is curious and interesting, however, to observe how in after ages the thorough-going advocates of the Court of Rome represent the matter, and find themselves compelled boldly to misrepresent Pope Leo as having done what they think he ought to have done, but which he never did, viz., complain of this canon having been passed without his authority, or because it derogated either expressly or inferentially from the dignity of his Apostolic See.

Binius, in the same note upon the 28th canon of Chalcedon which we have already referred to, asserts that it was condemned by St. Leo, not only because it was unlawfully passed without the authority of the Roman Pontiff, but also because it contained two manifest falsehoods. Those falsehoods, he says, were—first, that it was falsely stated in the said canon that the primacy was attributed to the Roman Pontiff by the Nicene Fathers, as if he had not possessed it before, whereas he says it appears, from the commencement of the 6th canon of Nice itself, that the Roman Church obtained the primacy neither from Councils nor from Christian Emperors, but from Christ Himself; the second falsehood was, he says, that the primacy was granted to the Roman Church, because Rome was the seat of empire, which he asserts was not the case.

Here it is obvious to the most cursory reader of Pope Leo's letters that Binius is putting into Leo's mouth,

¹ Hec tibi scribens, in Domino, hortor ac monco.

² No. xvi. in Labbe and Coss. tom. iv., p. 881.

³ Vol. iv. Labbe and Coss. p. 997.

¹ This may probably have been one among other reasons why Pope Leo should have been so anxious to have the 4th General Council held in Italy, and not in the East, as we have seen in our last number, p. 37.

¹ See Dupin, Eccl. Hist. Vol. i., p. 679. Labbe and Coss. tom. iv., p. 8. Ad calcem.

² Quorundam consensus præbuisse dicitur extorta subscriptio. "Superbiam nimis est et immoderatum, ultra fines proprios tendere, et antiquitate calcata alienum jus velle præripere, atque ut unus crescat dignitas, tot metropolitano impugnavit primatui, quietis quoque provinciarum, et olim Sanctæ Synodi Nicænæ moderatione disposita, bellum novæ perturbationis inferre, atque ut venerabilium patrum decreta solvantur, quorundam episcoporum proferre consensum, cui tot annorum series negativæ effectum. Nam sexagesimus fere annus hujus jactantie esse jactatur, quæ se prædictus episcopus matim adjuvari, frustra cupiens id sibi prodesse, quod etiamsi quicquam ausus est velle, nullum tamen potuit obtinere."—Labbe and Coss. tom. iii., p. 1337.

³ This clause was either foliated in by those who cooked the Decretal Epistles in subsequent times, or if it really proceeded from Pope Leo's pen, was plainly an argument which he thought only likely to pass current with a woman; for there is nothing similar to be found in any of his other letters on the subject to Marcian, Anatolius, or the Bishops of Chalcedon.

or attributing to his pen, things which were never uttered by the one nor written by the other. Leo never asserted that there was any defect in the Council of Chalcedon's proceedings because done contrary to his authority; but because these things had been done, whether by a coerced consent or not, contrary to the decrees of the previous Council of Nice. Leo never asserted that the 28th canon of Chalcedon stated falsehood as to the origin of the precedence of Rome, or the grounds on which it had enjoyed that precedence. But Binius thinks that Pope Leo ought to have done so, and therefore boldly asserts that he did so, and that on a ground which Leo never could have ventured on, viz., that the commencement of the 6th canon of Nice itself proved that the Church of Rome obtained her "primacy" neither from Councils nor Emperors, but from Christ Himself! Had Pope Leo relied on this asserted commencement of the 6th canon of Nice, the answer would have been a very simple one—that no extant copy of the canons of Nice had any such commencement, and that, when the Papal Legates attempted to read their heading to the said canon, as part of the canon, they were met at once by the Secretary of the Council at Chalcedon reading the canon, simply as it was passed at Nice, without any such prefix or addition.

It remains only for us briefly to show how unavailing were all Pope Leo's exertions, or those of his successors, Popes Felix and Gelasius, either to persuade the Imperial powers to annul, or even subsequent Popes to refuse their consent to, the new privileges thus conferred on the Patriarch of Constantinople by the General Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon.

The Emperor Justinian ascended the throne of the Cæsars A.D. 527, and by the 131st of his Novels, or additions to the civil law, chapters 1 and 2, concerning ecclesiastical titles and privileges, it is thus enacted:—

Chap. I.—We ordain that the holy ecclesiastical rules which were established or ratified by the four holy Councils shall obtain the force of laws. We mean the Council of Nice of 318, the Council of Constantinople of 150 Fathers, that of Ephesus, in which Nestorius was condemned, and that of Chalcedon, in which Eutyches was anathematized. For we accept the decrees of the aforesaid four synods as if they were in the Holy Scriptures, and will have them observed as laws.

Chap. II.—We in like manner ordain, according to their definitions, that the most holy Pope of the elder Rome is the first of all priests; but that the most blessed Archbishop of Constantinople (New Rome) has the second place after the holy Apostolic See of the elder Rome, and is to be preferred to all other Sees.

Thus was the 28th canon of Chalcedon recognised among the laws of the empire.

It only remains to show how it was adopted by subsequent Councils and Popes.

The first which we have met with was the Quinisext Council in A.D. 681, which confirmed the decrees of Chalcedon, without excepting any of them,³ and the precedence of Constantinople was again recognized at the 4th Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III. (when Frederick II. was Emperor), A.D. 1215.⁴

But the most decisive of all was that of the Council of Florence, under Pope Eugenius IV., A.D. 1439, which in terms renewed the order handed down to them in the canons, viz., that the Patriarch of Constantinople should be second after the holy Roman Pontiff, that the Patriarch of Alexandria should be third, Antioch the fourth, and Jerusalem the fifth, saving all their laws and privileges.⁵

We have now given our readers as clear a notion as we could in a short compass of the ineffectual struggle made against the 28th canon of Chalcedon by Pope Leo, which was followed up by some of his successors, and of the reluctant assent tardily given to it in after times by both Popes and Councils. There was, indeed, but one real ground on which it ever was opposed, though that was one which it would not have done for the Popes to have disclosed prematurely—namely, that it was directly against the notion (which, doubtless, Pope Leo I. and his successors had in their minds, though at that period the design was unknown and unsuspected by the rest of Christendom) that their central position in the ancient capital of the world, and acknowledged precedence as such, might, judiciously managed, be expanded into an ecclesiastical supremacy, which, some centuries later, amid the decline of the Empire, it actually became.

HOW THE FATHERS ARE TREATED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.—No. II.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

ONE of the maxims, the application of which the advocates of the Church of Rome find most inconvenient in practice, is the maxim that *truth must be always the same*. From this it would follow, that if the Church of Rome teaches true doctrines now, we ought to find the same doctrines taught

in every preceding age of the Church, up to the time of the Apostles themselves. But it turns out, that when we proceed to examine, we find not a word in the Bible, or in the early Fathers, concerning some of the doctrines on which Roman Catholics now lay most stress; but, on the contrary, we find the teaching of that primitive Church, to all appearance at least, the direct contrary of modern Roman Catholic teaching. To solve this difficulty, some clever and courageous modern advocates of Romanism have started a theory that truth need not be always the same; but, unfortunately, this theory was not invented until after the Church of Rome had repeatedly committed herself to the statement that she taught nothing new—nothing that the Church did not teach and receive from the beginning. And the most common way by which she has endeavoured to escape the practical inconvenience arising from the difference between ancient and modern teaching is by keeping her people as much as possible from the knowledge of the ancient teaching. We all know with how little favour Bible-reading is regarded by Roman Catholics; and one of the rules of the committee appointed under the Council of Trent for the prohibiting of dangerous books particularly condemns translations of the Bible, as being likely to do more harm than good to those who use them. And Protestants, too, have found the wisdom of using the circulation of the Scriptures as one of their principal weapons against Romanism, being persuaded that the peculiar tenets of that Church cannot continue to be believed in by any who take the trouble to compare them with the teaching of the Bible. It is fortunate for the Church of Rome that the writings of the Fathers occupy some scores of bulky volumes, and that great part of them are such as would not interest readers of the present day; for we have no doubt that it would be nearly as mischievous to the Church of Rome if her people were extensively to compare her teaching with that of the Fathers of the first three or four centuries as if they were to compare it with the Bible. And if Protestants were to form societies for the gratuitous circulation of the Fathers among Roman Catholics, we should find the priests oppose them as angrily as they have done the Bible societies. The fact is, that the priests would like both the Bible and the Fathers if they would only speak on their side, but they cannot venture to trust them to speak with perfect freedom. They treat them as some criminals have been treated who have been anxious to address the people on the scaffold, and who have obtained permission to speak as long as they did not touch on any topic objectionable to the ruling powers, but who were forcibly silenced the moment that they introduced any of these dangerous subjects. In an article in our last number, we have given some account of the general policy of the Church of Rome with respect to the Fathers, and we showed that there was good reason for the distrust which Protestants generally feel as to the fair dealing of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, where the interests of their Church are concerned. Suppose, for instance, that the librarians of the Vatican were to discover there unpublished writings of some venerable Father, containing strong testimony against the doctrines or practice of their Church: in such a case what would they be likely to do? Protestants would strongly suspect that in such a case the interests of the Church would be considered first, and the interests of truth second—that if the manuscript were not destroyed or altered, it would, at least, be quietly cushioned, and nothing would be heard about it. The Roman Catholic authorities have been always more anxious to make the books they circulate conformable to the doctrine approved by their Church than to make them be exactly what their authors intended them to be.

However, it is now time to leave reasoning on the avowed principles of Roman Catholic authorities, and speculating on what they would be likely to do, and to give some instances of what they have actually done. In the present article we shall give a historical sketch of the adventures of a remarkable epistle ascribed to St. Chrysostom.

One of the leading points of difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics is the question of the Eucharist, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, asserted by the latter and denied by the former. If we try to find out with which side any ancient Father agrees, there is one difficulty, arising from the fact that all parties use very much the same language. All parties agree in describing in the loftiest words the benefits received by the faithful partaker of that holy sacrament. The catechism of the Church of England asserts that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper; and language no less strong is freely employed by all her eminent divines. In fact, since our Lord Himself, when delivering that sacred food, said, "This is my body," "This is my blood," no one who acknowledges His authority can hesitate to use similar language; and the only difference that can exist between Christians is as to the sense in which that language is to be understood. It is of no use, then, to bring forward from the Fathers, as some Roman Catholics do, passages in which similar language is employed, and to suppose that they prove the doctrine of Transubstantiation, when language just as strong is used by members of the Church of England. The whole question is as to the meaning of the language. We hold that the means by which the body of our Lord is received is *faith*. We deny that a conversion takes place indepen-

dently of the faith of the recipients; such that even a dog or mouse who should consume the consecrated elements would take the body of our Lord. We reject the carnal and literal meaning put upon our Lord's words by those who first heard Him and which He Himself condemned. "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." Now, there is one very decisive test, whether the ancient Fathers agreed with us on this point or whether they held Romish doctrine. The scholastic divines, who invented the theory of Transubstantiation, had the sagacity to see that in the gross literal sense the consecrated elements could not be two things at a time. If they were the body and blood of our Lord, they must cease to be bread and wine. Accordingly, they teach that when the words of consecration are spoken, the substance of the bread and wine are absolutely and altogether annihilated. This is the doctrine which is formally adopted by the Church of Rome; sanctioned by her Councils; taught in her catechisms, and believed by her people. It is sufficient, then, to examine, did the Fathers believe that the substance of bread and wine remained in the elements of the Eucharist after consecration. If they did it is evident that they did not hold Roman Catholic doctrine, and that no matter what language they may use in speaking of the dignity of that sacrament, still they did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

At the time of the Reformation there was warm controversy as to the sentiments of the Fathers on all the disputed points between the Church of Rome and the Reformers, and, of course, the subject of Transubstantiation then received peculiar attention. Among other testimonies the Reformer, Peter Martyr, in a disputation with Bishop Gardiner, alleged the following passage from a then unpublished epistle of St. Chrysostom to the monk Casarius.

"Now, as before the bread is sanctified we call it bread; but when the divine grace sanctifies it through the mediation of the priest, it is freed from the name of bread, and is worthy to be called the Lord's body, although the nature of bread remains in it."⁶

In this passage we are taught expressly that though St. Chrysostom scruples not to call the elements after consecration by the name of those things which they represent, he calls them so not because he believes them to have lost their original nature, and to have ceased to be what they were, but because being hallowed to a new and higher purpose they may be called that which they are the means of communicating. These words, in which the doctrine of Transubstantiation is contradicted in terms, caused no small perplexity to the Roman Catholic divines of the day, and they were beginning to take some pains to see how they could be reconciled with the teaching of their Church, when the death of Edward the Sixth and the accession of Queen Mary enabled them to find a different reply. Peter Martyr's manuscript copy of this passage from St. Chrysostom had been lodged in Archbishop Cranmer's library, which, under Mary's reign, fell into the hands of his theological opponents. If Protestants have any prejudices as to the manner in which Roman Catholics would be likely to treat an ancient document which told against them, we are sorry that this history does not afford us the means of refuting those prejudices. Peter Martyr's transcript from St. Chrysostom was soon not forthcoming. No tidings could be had of this valuable record of antiquity, and by this time Martyr was dead, and there were no means of ascertaining from what authority he had made his transcription. The Roman Catholic controversialists were now on velvet, and when this passage from St. Chrysostom was alleged against them in controversy, they boldly set it aside as an impudent forgery of Peter Martyr. In the process of years, however, a new light was thrown on the matter. A very learned and honest French Roman Catholic, Emeric Bigot, in the course of his literary travels, happened to come across the very manuscript from which, in all probability, Peter Martyr had made his copy; for Peter Martyr was a Florentine, and the manuscript found by Bigot was discovered in a Dominican monastery at Florence. Bigot carefully transcribed the epistle, and prepared it for publication, together with Palladius's life of St. Chrysostom and some other ancient writings till then unpublished. The work was duly printed, but before it was presented to the public an unexpected impediment arose. The literary censors of the Sorbonne learned with great alarm this part of the contents of Bigot's forthcoming work. They could not see without apprehension Peter Martyr cleared from the charge of forgery, and the reformers justifying their opposition to Transubstantiation by the authority of one of the most venerated Fathers of the Church. To avoid these dangerous consequences, Bigot was compelled by the King's authority to cancel all this dangerous part of his work. Such a change after the book had been all printed was rather a troublesome one to make, and the absence of the pages, numbered 236-245, remains as perpetual evidence of the mutilation of the volume. It is no harm to tell at full length the various changes which the omission of this epistle involved, by which it will be seen

What a tangled web we weave,
When first we practice to deceive.

In the first place, as the title page contained a list of the different treatises contained in the volume, it was necessary to cancel the old title page, and print a new

³ Corpus Juris Civilis, Authentica seu Novella, p. 262. Lugdun.³ 1666.

⁴ See Labbe and Cœsa. tom. vi., p. 1141.

⁵ Labbe and Cœsa. tom. xl. pt. i., p. 158.

⁶ "Removantes inasper ordinem traditionis in canonicis, ceterosque venerabilium patriarcharum, et patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum sententias ac post multos annos Romanorum pontificum, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus antem Antiochenus, et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salva videlicet privilegia omnibus et juribus eorum."—Labbe and Cœsa. tom. xiii., p. 1167-8.